

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION

ORDER NO. R5-2005-

NPDES NO. CA0081507

WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
SHASTA COUNTY SERVICE AREA NO. 17
COTTONWOOD WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT
SHASTA COUNTY

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, (hereafter Regional Board) finds that:

REPORT OF WASTE DISCHARGE

1. The Shasta County Service Area No. 17 (Cottonwood Wastewater Treatment Plant, hereafter Discharger, submitted a complete report of waste discharge (ROWD) on 21 October 2003, under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), and applied for a permit renewal to discharge treated wastewater (effluent) to Cottonwood Creek, a tributary of the Sacramento River.

**WASTEWATER TREATMENT, WASTEWATER COLLECTION,
AND GENERAL SITE INFORMATION**

2. The community of Cottonwood is located in southern Shasta County approximately 15 miles south of the city of Redding, along Interstate 5. The population of Cottonwood is approximately 2960 people, based on the year 2000 U.S. Census. Cottonwood is located at an approximate elevation of 420 feet MSL and receives an average of 30 inches of rain per year.
3. The treatment plant is located in Section 12, T29N, R4W, MDB&M, as shown on Attachment A, a part of this Order. The treatment plant is located within the Lower Cottonwood Hydrologic Sub Area No. 508.20, as depicted on interagency hydrologic maps prepared by the Department of Water Resources in August 1986.
4. The treatment plant discharges to Cottonwood Creek approximately 5 miles upstream from its confluence with the Sacramento River. The discharge point, D001, is located at 40°22' 40" latitude and 122° 16' 15" longitude.
5. The wastewater treatment plant consists of: a headworks with bar screen and Parshall flume with ultrasonic level sensor; two, parallel oxidation ditches with aerators; two, parallel secondary clarifiers with skimmers; traveling-bridge sand filter unit; chlorine disinfection with chlorine gas; serpentine chlorine contact chamber; dechlorination by addition of sulfur dioxide; an outfall line and diffuser to Cottonwood Creek; a northern 4.3 acre-feet sludge settling basin (formerly 0.83 acre-feet), a southern 0.63 acre-feet sludge settling basin; and four, sludge/sand drying beds. A schematic of the treatment plant layout is shown in Attachment B.

6. In March 2002, the north sludge storage basin (SSB) was detected to be leaking. The north SSB was replaced by the end of December 2002. The original south SSB is now empty, as it is also suspected of leaking. The expanded north SSB has sufficient capacity to handle the current treatment plant design flow. However, the south SSB may need to be repaired in order to provide redundancy and allow the north SSB to be periodically taken offline for maintenance.
7. The summer and fall flow in Cottonwood Creek provides somewhat limited dilution to the treatment plant effluent discharge. Dilution in the winter and spring is adequate. Accurate low flow data for Cottonwood Creek in the vicinity of the discharge is required in order to determine available dilution and determine if the discharge is in compliance with the Basin Plan and other guidance. If the Discharger chooses to do a dilution and mixing zone study, adequate flow information will also be required.
8. The effluent diffuser located in Cottonwood Creek has been damaged. Reportedly, it is not currently providing any diffusion function. This Order requires the Discharger to repair or replace the diffuser.
9. The chlorination and dechlorination chemical feed controls at the wastewater treatment plant are designed to be automatically paced based on flow or concentration. Currently, the equipment is not functioning and the chemical dosing equipment is set manually. Manual operation of this equipment is not in accordance with the original plant design, and threatens to cause an effluent violation due to over- or under-dosing. This Order requires the Discharger to repair or replace this equipment.
10. The Discharger is required to analyze effluent samples for chronic toxicity and some of these analyses have documented adverse effects to the test organisms in the presence of the effluent. If additional information indicates that the discharge threatens to cause chronic toxicity in the receiving water, then the Discharger may be required to conduct a Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) and Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE). Additionally, this Order may be reopened and an effluent limit for the constituent(s) causing the toxicity added, as appropriate.
11. Discharge from the wastewater treatment plant is presently regulated by Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 98-233 (NPDES No. CA0081507), adopted by the Board on 11 December 1998.
12. The ROWD describes the treatment plant effluent as follows:
 - Annual Average Daily Flow (average of last three years): 0.289 million gallons per day (mgd)
 - Daily Peak Flow (highest of last three years): 0.373 mgd
 - Design Flow: 0.43 mgd
 - pH: 6.0 minimum, 6.8 maximum

Constituent	<u>mg/L</u>	<u>lbs/day</u>
Average BOD ¹	2	7 ³
Average TSS ²	2	7 ³
¹ 5-day, 20°C biochemical oxygen demand. ² Total suspended solids. ³ Based upon permitted flow of 0.43 mgd.		

13. The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Regional Board have classified this discharge as a minor discharge.

WATER QUALITY CONTROL PLAN, NATIONAL TOXICS RULE, AND CALIFORNIA TOXICS RULE

14. The Regional Board adopted a Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition, for the Sacramento River Basin and the San Joaquin River Basin (hereafter Basin Plan), which designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives for those beneficial uses, and establishes implementation programs and policies to achieve water quality objectives for all waters of the Basin. These requirements implement the Basin Plan.
15. The USEPA adopted the National Toxics Rule (NTR) on 5 February 1993 and the California Toxics Rule (CTR) on 18 May 2000 (amended on 13 February 2001). These Rules contain water quality standards applicable to this discharge. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopted the Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California (known as the State Implementation Policy or SIP) that contains guidance on implementation of the NTR and the CTR.
16. On 8 December 2000, the Discharger was issued a letter under the authority of California Water Code (CWC) Section 13267 requiring effluent and receiving water monitoring to meet the data collection requirements of the SIP. The Discharger sampled effluent from the treatment plant and receiving water on two occasions to determine if the priority pollutants established in the CTR and NTR were detected. A listing of all priority pollutants in the NTR and CTR that were detected by the Discharger's sampling, and the water quality objective for the pollutant are presented in the attached Information Sheet. This data was used to determine the necessity of including effluent limitations for priority pollutants in this permit.

BENEFICIAL USES OF THE RECEIVING WATER

17. The Basin Plan on page II-2.00 states: "Existing and potential beneficial uses which currently apply to surface waters of the basins are presented in Figure II-1 and Table II-1. The beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams."
18. The Basin Plan identifies the following beneficial uses for Cottonwood Creek: municipal and domestic supply (MUN); irrigation and stock watering agricultural supply (AGR); industrial process supply (PROC); industrial service supply (IND), hydropower generation (POW); water

contact and noncontact recreation (REC-1 and REC-2); warm and cold freshwater habitat (WARM and COLD); cold water migration of aquatic organisms (MIGR); warm and cold water spawning, reproduction, and/or early development (SPWN); and, wildlife habitat (WILD). Upon review of the flow conditions, habitat values, and beneficial uses of Cottonwood Creek, the Regional Board finds that the beneficial uses identified in the Basin Plan for Cottonwood Creek are applicable.

19. The Basin Plan defines beneficial uses and with respect to disposal of wastewaters states that "...disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses.
20. Unless designated otherwise by the Regional Board, the beneficial uses of groundwater of the Central Valley Region are municipal and domestic water supply, agricultural supply, industrial service supply, and industrial process supply.

EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND REASONABLE POTENTIAL

21. Effluent limitations, and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to Sections 301 (Effluent Limitations), 302 (Water Quality Related Effluent Limitations), 304 (Information Guidelines), and 307 (Toxic Pretreatment Effluent Standards) of the Clean Water Act (CWA), and amendments thereto, are applicable to the discharge.
22. Federal regulations contained in 40 CFR Part 122.44 (d) require effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at a level that will cause or have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numerical water quality standard (reasonable potential). A Basin Plan standard is defined as the beneficial use and the water quality objective that will protect that beneficial use.
23. Determining reasonable potential for pollutants other than those contained in the CTR and NTR is accomplished by analyzing treatment plant operations, past effluent monitoring results, and other pertinent factors. In addition, the USEPA has provided guidance for the analysis of reasonable potential in their *Technical Support Document for Water Quality Based Toxics Control (TSD)*(EPA/505/2-90-101), which has been considered in this permit for developing effluent limitations for pollutants other than those in the CTR and NTR.
24. In determining effluent limits, the Regional Board did not allow credit for the dilution of effluent with the receiving water. Effluent limits, therefore, have been established to meet the water quality standard at the point of discharge (end-of-pipe"). The Regional Board may grant a dilution credit and a mixing zone only if a sufficient study and demonstration is made that a dilution credit and mixing zone are appropriate and protective of receiving water beneficial uses.
25. In consideration of the above beneficial use designations, lack of proven, available dilution, and determination of reasonable potential, effluent limitations for the following non-priority pollutants have been established in this Order:

a. *Total and Fecal Coliform Organisms*

In a letter to the Regional Board dated 8 April 1999, the California Department of Health Services indicated that DHS would consider wastewater discharged to water bodies with identified beneficial uses of irrigation, contact recreation, or a drinking water source to be adequately disinfected if: 1) the wastewater receives dilution of more than 20:1; 2) the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 23 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median; and 3) the effluent coliform concentration does not exceed 240 MPN/100 mL more than once in any 30 day period. Municipal water supply is a beneficial use of Cottonwood Creek, as noted above. DHS recommends that samples be obtained for coliform at least twice per week if this coliform effluent limitation is used.

The effluent limit for total coliform in the previous Order was 23 MPN/100mL as a monthly median, and 500 MPN/100mL as a daily maximum. This effluent limit does not meet the current recommendation by DHS, nor does it guarantee that the Basin Plan receiving water objective will be met. Therefore, this Order establishes an effluent limit for total coliform of 23 MPN/100mL as a 7-day median, 240 MPN/100mL may only be exceeded one time during any 30-day period, and 500 MPN/100mL as a daily maximum. Additionally, during the summer and fall seasons, a 20:1 dilution of effluent in Cottonwood Creek may not be achievable, which would potentially necessitate alternative disposal solutions or more stringent treatment and disinfection requirements. As the fecal coliform concentration of any sample is less than or equal to the total coliform concentration in accordance with the bacteriological definition of coliform and analytical detection procedures for these bacteria, these effluent limitations will implement the Basin Plan water quality objective for fecal coliform.

b. *Toxic compounds:* Aquatic habitat based upon the WARM and COLD designations is a beneficial use of Cottonwood Creek. The Basin Plan narrative toxicity standard requires that "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life."

- *Chlorine*-The Discharger disinfects treated effluent with chlorine, which is toxic to aquatic organisms. The USEPA has developed recommended chlorine ambient water quality criteria to protect freshwater aquatic organisms. Their criterion is used in this Order to implement the narrative toxicity objective of the Basin Plan. The USEPA's ambient water quality criteria for total residual chlorine for protection of aquatic life are 11 ug/L as a 4-day average (chronic) concentration, and 19 ug/L as a one-hour average (acute) concentration. This permit contains effluent discharge limitations for total residual chlorine of 0.01 mg/L as a four-day average, and 0.02 mg/L as a maximum 1-hour average, based on the USEPA ambient criteria to protect aquatic life. The one-hour average limitation, rather than an instantaneous or daily maximum, will be applied for compliance determinations. A one-hour average limitation allows for continuous monitoring anomalies while protecting aquatic organisms against toxicity.

- *Ammonia*- Domestic wastewater treatment plants that do not nitrify (convert ammonia to nitrate) generally produce effluent with ammonia concentrations exceeding USEPA recommended freshwater criteria. Although the wastewater treatment plant is capable of nitrification, nitrification may not fully occur year-round. The toxicity of ammonia depends on such factors as fish life stages present, receiving water temperature, and receiving water pH. Therefore, there may be a reasonable potential for effluent ammonia to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if there is inadequate dilution and mixing of effluent in Cottonwood Creek. The USEPA has published revised ambient water quality criteria for ammonia (*1999 Ammonia Update*). This Order contains requirements for monitoring effluent ammonia, and a reopener to set ammonia effluent limitations if it is determined that ammonia in the effluent presents a reasonable potential for exceedance of a water quality objective.

c. Electrical Conductivity

The Basin Plan does not specify a water quality objective for electrical conductivity (EC) in Cottonwood Creek. The Basin Plan does contain a water quality objective for EC for the portion of the Sacramento River to which Cottonwood Creek is tributary. This objective is 230 micromhos/cm as a 50th percentile. No data has been obtained regarding the EC level in the discharge or in Cottonwood Creek. This proposed Order requires the Discharger to obtain data on effluent and receiving water EC to confirm that water quality in Cottonwood Creek and the downstream Sacramento River will not be unacceptably impacted by EC.

d. BOD and Total Suspended Solids

This permit contains effluent limits for BOD and total suspended solids (TSS). Federal regulations in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 133 provide technology based effluent limitations for BOD and TSS for secondary treatment. Pursuant to the regulations at 40 CFR Parts 133.105(a), (b), and 133.103, the BOD and TSS 30-day average discharge limitations for secondary treatment shall not exceed 30 mg/L, the 7-day average shall not exceed 45 mg/L, and the 30-day BOD and TSS removal shall not be less than 85 percent.

e. pH

The Basin Plan requires that the pH of any receiving water not be greater than 8.5 nor lower than 6.5 units. The Report of Waste Discharge submitted by the Discharger indicates the lowest and highest pH values of 6.0 and 6.8 in the effluent, respectively. These readings indicate that the current wastewater treatment activity has a reasonable potential to generate effluent with pH values that could adversely affect beneficial uses. The Federal Clean Water Act, Section 301, requires that not later than 1 July 1977, publicly owned wastewater treatment works meet effluent limitations based on secondary treatment or any more stringent limitation necessary to meet water quality

standards. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR, Part 133, establish the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for pH.

26. On 27 February 2001, 12 July 2001 (for dioxin congeners only), and 11 January 2002, the Discharger collected effluent and receiving water samples for analyses of the CTR toxic priority pollutants. Analyses were performed for volatile and semi-volatile substances, metals, 2,3,7,8-TCDD dioxin, and sixteen other dioxin congeners and reported in accordance with procedures established by the SIP.

Methodology described in Section 1.3 of the SIP was used to evaluate the Discharger's monitoring data for the CTR priority toxic pollutants. No credit for dilution of the effluent with the receiving water was considered. Copper, zinc, cyanide, bromodichloromethane, chloroform, and bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate were detected at concentrations that may cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a numerical water quality standard of the CTR or the Basin Plan.

Final water quality based effluent limitations for copper and zinc are included in this Order, as described below. Effluent limitations for cyanide, bromodichloromethane, chloroform, and bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate are not established in this Order because insufficient information exists at this time to determine if an effluent limit is necessary for these pollutants, as discussed below.

Copper

The CTR and Basin Plan include hardness-dependent standards for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. Freshwater aquatic habitat is a beneficial use of the receiving water. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors (translators) to translate dissolved concentrations of certain metals to total recoverable concentrations. The translator for copper in freshwater is 0.960 for both the acute and the chronic criteria. Using a water hardness of 94 mg/L as CaCO₃ (the lowest hardness value observed in the receiving water), the most stringent applicable water quality standards for copper are 8.5 and 12.2 ug/L (dissolved) based on the CTR chronic and Basin Plan acute criteria, respectively, for protection of aquatic life. The highest observed concentrations were in samples collected on 11 January 2002, where copper (total recoverable) was measured at 12 and 3.6 ug/L in the effluent and receiving water, respectively. After applying the translator, these highest effluent or receiving water samples concentrations exceed the most stringent water quality standards and therefore, effluent limitations are required. Determination of reasonable potential and calculation of effluent limits is further explained in the attached Information Sheet for this Order.

The effluent limitation for copper is a new requirement in this Order. Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that: *“Based on an existing discharger’s request and demonstration that it is infeasible for the discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion, or with an effluent limitation based on a CTR criterion, the RWQCB may establish a compliance schedule in an NPDES permit.”* However, in accordance with the Regional Board’s *Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*, presented in Chapter IV of the Basin Plan, schedules for compliance with final effluent limitations for copper, which are based on water

quality criteria or objectives adopted before 25 September 1995, may not be authorized in an NPDES permit. Therefore, the final effluent limits established in this Order for copper, become immediately applicable on the effective date of this Order. However, the Regional Board may adopt other Orders, such as a Cease and Desist Order, allowing the Discharger a period of time to fully comply with the effluent limit for copper.

Zinc

The CTR and Basin Plan include hardness-dependent standards for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for zinc. Freshwater aquatic habitat is a beneficial use of the receiving water. U.S. EPA recommends conversion factors (translators) to translate dissolved concentrations of certain metals to total recoverable concentrations. The translator for zinc in freshwater is 0.978 and 0.986 for the acute and the chronic criteria, respectively. Using a water hardness of 94 mg/L as CaCO₃ (the lowest hardness value observed in the receiving water), the most stringent applicable water quality standards for zinc are 112 and 32.5 ug/L (dissolved) based on the CTR chronic and Basin Plan acute criteria, respectively, for protection of aquatic life. The highest observed concentrations were in samples collected on 11 January 2002, where zinc (total recoverable) was measured at 52 and 18 ug/L in the effluent and receiving water, respectively. After applying the translator, these highest effluent or receiving water samples concentrations exceed the most stringent water quality standards and therefore, effluent limitations are required. Determination of reasonable potential and calculation of effluent limits is further explained in the attached Information Sheet for this Order.

The effluent limitation for zinc is a new requirement in this Order. Section 2.1 of the SIP provides that: *“Based on an existing discharger’s request and demonstration that it is infeasible for the discharger to achieve immediate compliance with a CTR criterion, or with an effluent limitation based on a CTR criterion, the RWQCB may establish a compliance schedule in an NPDES permit.”* However, in accordance with the Regional Board’s *Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*, presented in Chapter IV of the Basin Plan, schedules for compliance with final effluent limitations for zinc, which are based on water quality criteria or objectives adopted before 25 September 1995, may not be authorized in an NPDES permit. Therefore, the final effluent limits established in this Order for zinc, become immediately applicable on the effective date of this Order. However, the Regional Board may adopt other Orders, such as a Cease and Desist Order, allowing the Discharger a period of time to fully comply with the effluent limit for zinc.

Cyanide

Cyanide was detected in the effluent sample collected on 27 February 2001 at a concentration of 54 ug/L, and in the receiving water at 5 ug/L. The CTR chronic and acute criteria (independent of hardness) for the protection of freshwater aquatic life are 5.2 ug/L and 22 ug/L, respectively. The Basin Plan (Table III-1) instantaneous maximum (acute) objective is 10 ug/L, independent of hardness. Therefore, the most stringent, applicable water quality standard for cyanide is the CTR chronic criteria of 5.2 ug/L for the protection of freshwater aquatic life. The analytical laboratory that performed the cyanide analyses for the Discharger originally reported incorrect results and later issued revised results. The reported presence of

cyanide in the effluent at 54 ug/L, and especially the reported presence in the receiving water is somewhat unexpected, and when considered with the laboratory reporting problems, the data is unreliable. Therefore, insufficient information exists to determine if an effluent limit for cyanide is appropriate. This Order requires the effluent to be monitored for cyanide, and if, after sufficient information has been collected, it can be determined that reasonable potential exists for the effluent to exceed a water quality standard for cyanide, this Order may be reopened and an effluent limit for cyanide added, as appropriate.

Bromodichloromethane

Bromodichloromethane was detected in the effluent sample collected on 11 January 2002 at a concentration of 3 ug/L. It was not detected in the effluent sample collected on 27 February 2001, however. The CTR human health criteria for consumption of water and organisms is 0.56 ug/L. Although the Basin Plan does not include numerical water quality criteria for bromodichloromethane, there is a narrative water quality objective of the Basin Plan for toxicity, which states that all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. To interpret this narrative objective, the Regional Board relies on its *Compilation of Water Quality Goals* (2000), which includes the Cal/EPA Cancer Potency Factor, established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), of 0.27 ug/L for bromodichloromethane. Because the health-based criteria maintained by the OEHHA are used as a basis for California state regulatory action, in accordance with the Regional Board's policy, this criterion is given preference when interpreting narrative water quality objectives. [Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, *A Compilation of Water Quality Goals*, at page 15 (2000)] Additionally, a California Primary MCL of 100 ug/L has been established for Total Trihalomethanes (bromoform, bromodichloromethane, chloroform, and dibromochloromethane). The Basin Plan states that, "At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)...incorporated by reference into this plan."

The most stringent, applicable water quality standard for bromodichloromethane is the CTR Human Health criteria for consumption of water and organisms of 0.56 ug/L. The Cal/EPA Cancer Potency Factor of 0.27 ug/L should also be considered.

Trihalomethanes, comprised of the typical chlorination byproduct compounds bromoform, bromodichloromethane, chloroform and dibromochloromethane can be formed in the chlorination process at wastewater treatment plants. While it is not unexpected that trihalomethanes would be present in the effluent, insufficient information exists at this time to establish an effluent limitation. Therefore, this Order requires the effluent to be monitored for trihalomethanes, and if, after sufficient information has been collected, it can be determined that reasonable potential exists for the effluent to exceed a water quality standard for any of the trihalomethane compounds, this Order may be reopened and an effluent limit for the compound(s) added, as appropriate.

Chloroform

Chloroform was detected in the effluent samples collected on 27 February 2001 and 11 January 2002 at concentrations of 2.2 ug/L and 20 ug/L, respectively. Although the CTR does not include numerical water quality criteria for chloroform, there is a narrative water quality objective of the Basin Plan for toxicity, which states that all waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life. To interpret this narrative objective, the Regional Board relies on its *Compilation of Water Quality Goals* (2000), which includes the Cal/EPA Cancer Potency Factor, established by the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), of 1.1 ug/L for chloroform. Because the health-based criteria maintained by the OEHHA are used as a basis for California state regulatory action, in accordance with the Regional Board's policy, this criterion is given preference when interpreting narrative water quality objectives. [Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, A Compilation of Water Quality Goals, at page 15 (2000)] Additionally, a California Primary MCL of 100 ug/L has been established for Total Trihalomethanes (bromoform, bromodichloromethane, chloroform, and dibromochloromethane). The Basin Plan states that, "At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)...incorporated by reference into this plan."

The most stringent, applicable water quality standard for chloroform is the Cal/EPA Cancer Potency Factor of 1.1 ug/L.

Trihalomethanes, comprised of the typical chlorination byproduct compounds bromoform, bromodichloromethane, chloroform and dibromochloromethane can be formed in the chlorination process at wastewater treatment plants. While it is not unexpected that trihalomethanes would be present in the effluent, insufficient information exists at this time to establish an effluent limitation. Therefore, this Order requires the effluent to be monitored for trihalomethanes, and if, after sufficient information has been collected, it can be determined that reasonable potential exists for the effluent to exceed a water quality standard for any of the trihalomethane compounds, this Order may be reopened and an effluent limit for the compound(s) added, as appropriate.

Bis-2-Ethylhexylphthalate

Bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate was detected in the effluent and receiving water samples collected on 11 January 2002 at concentrations of 2 ug/L and 10 ug/L, respectively. It was not detected in either the effluent or receiving water samples collected on 27 February 2001. The CTR Human Health Criteria for consumption of water and organisms is 1.8 ug/L. Additionally, a California Primary MCL of 4 ug/L has been established for bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate. The Basin Plan states that, "At a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) ...incorporated by reference into this plan."

The most stringent, applicable water quality standard for bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate is the CTR Human Health criteria for consumption of water and organisms of 1.8 ug/L.

Bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate is a common contaminant of sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment, and it is therefore possible that the contaminant is not truly present in the receiving water or effluent discharge. This Order requires the Discharger to take steps to assure that sampling containers and apparatus are not the source of this contaminant. If changes in sampling and/or analytical procedures and equipment indicate that bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate is not actually present in the effluent or receiving water samples at concentrations that trigger reasonable potential according to the SIP, then effluent limits are not necessary. If bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate continues to be detected in the effluent and/or receiving water, then this Order may be reopened and modified to include an appropriate effluent limitation for bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate.

27. Section 1.4 of the SIP establishes procedures for calculating effluent limitations. Included in the procedures is determination of a dilution credit, which the Regional Board may approve or disapprove at its discretion. However, the Discharger has not developed the information needed to determine a dilution credit, and based on the limited information that is available, it appears that the receiving water may have very limited dilution capacity during the low flow seasons. Consequently, this Order establishes final effluent limitations based on zero dilution. This Order also has a reopener that allows new effluent limitations to be adopted if a mixing zone and dilution study demonstrates that dilution credits are appropriate.
28. As stated in *Standard Provisions and Reporting Requirements, For Waste Discharge Requirements, 1 March 1991, General Provisions, No. 13*, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.41 (m), define “bypass” as the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. This section of the Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.41 (m)(4), prohibits bypass unless it is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. In considering the Regional Board’s prohibition of bypasses, the State Water Resources Control Board adopted a precedential decision, Order No. WQO 2002-0015, which cites the Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. In the case of *United States v. City of Toledo, Ohio* (63 F. Supp 2d 834, N.D. Ohio 1999) the Federal Court ruled “*any bypass which occurs because of inadequate plant capacity is unauthorized...to the extent that there are ‘feasible alternatives’, including the construction or installation of additional treatment capacity.*”
29. This Order contains provisions and monitoring program requirements that require the Discharger to conduct additional sampling to provide information on the concentrations of all priority pollutants in the discharge.
30. Section 13263.6(a), CWC, requires that “the regional board shall prescribe effluent limitations as part of the waste discharge requirements of a POTW [Publicly Owned Treatment Works] for all substances that the most recent toxic chemical release data reported to the state emergency response commission pursuant to Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community

Right to Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 11023) (EPCRA) indicate as discharged into the POTW, for which the state board or the regional board has established numeric water quality objectives, and has determined that the discharge is or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to, an excursion above any numeric water quality objective.” Review of the available toxic release reporting data for 1998 through 2003 did not reveal any release of toxic chemicals to the treatment plant. Therefore, under the requirements of EPCRA, there is no requirement for setting of effluent limitations for any toxic chemical regulated in accordance with this section of the Water Code.

COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL POLICIES REGARDING WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION

31. The permitted discharge is consistent with the anti-degradation provisions of 40 CFR Part 131.12 and with SWRCB Resolution 68-16 (Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality Water of Waters in California). Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

SEWER SYSTEM OVERFLOW PREVENTION

32. The Discharger’s sanitary sewer system collects wastewater using sewers, gravity and pressure piping, pumps, and/or other conveyance systems and directs this raw sewage to the treatment plant. A “sanitary sewer overflow” is defined as a discharge to ground or surface water from the sanitary sewer system at any point upstream of the wastewater treatment plant. Temporary storage and conveyance facilities (such as wet wells, regulated impoundments, tanks, highlines, etc.) may be part of a sanitary sewer system and discharges to these facilities are not considered sanitary sewer overflows, provided that the waste is fully contained within these temporary storage/conveyance facilities.
33. The potential causes of sanitary sewer overflows that may affect this sewer system include grease blockages, root blockages, debris blockages, air relief/vacuum valve failures, vandalism, storm or groundwater inflow/infiltration, snow melt infiltration, lift station pump failure or blockage, and lack of capacity, both hydraulic capacity of the sewer and pumping station capacity. Sanitary sewer overflows pose a threat to public health, may adversely affect aquatic life, and may impair the recreational use and aesthetic enjoyment of surface waters in the area.
34. Adequate steps must be taken to maintain and operate the sewer system and prevent sewer system overflows. This Order requires the Discharger to prepare and implement sewer system operation, maintenance, overflow prevention, and overflow response plans for the sewer collection system.

MANAGEMENT OF STORM WATER

35. The USEPA, on 16 November 1990, promulgated storm water regulations (40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124) that require specific categories of industrial facilities which discharge storm

water to obtain NPDES permits and to implement Best Available Technology Economically Achievable and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology to reduce or eliminate industrial storm water pollution. Wastewater treatment plants with design flows of less than one million gallons per day are not required to obtain an NPDES permit for storm water discharges. The design flow of the Cottonwood Wastewater Treatment Plant is 0.43 mgd. Therefore, the Discharger is not required to obtain an NPDES permit for storm water discharges.

**COMPLIANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT,
NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, AND MISCELLANEOUS**

36. Monitoring is required by this Order for the purposes of assessing compliance with permit limitations and water quality objectives and gathering information to evaluate the need for additional limitations.
37. Section 13267 of the California Water Code states, in part, “(a) *A regional board, in establishing...waste discharge requirements... may investigate the quality of any waters of the state within its region*” and “(b) (1) *In conducting an investigation... the regional board may require that any person who... discharges... waste...that could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the report and the benefits to be obtained from the reports.*” The attached Monitoring and Reporting Program is issued pursuant to California Water Code Section 13267. The monitoring and reporting program required by this Order and the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program are necessary to assure compliance with these waste discharge requirements. The Discharger is responsible for the discharges of waste at the facility subject to this Order.
38. The Regional Board has considered the information in the attached Information Sheet in developing the Findings of this Order. The Information Sheet, Monitoring and Reporting Program No. _____, and Attachments A through E are a part of this Order.
39. The action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.), in accordance with Section 13389 of the CWC. The treatment plant is also an existing facility, which exempts it from CEQA.
40. The Regional Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe waste discharge requirements for this discharge and has provided them with an opportunity for a public hearing and an opportunity to submit their written views and recommendations.
41. The Regional Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge.

42. This Order shall serve as an NPDES permit pursuant to Section 402 of the CWA, and amendments thereto, and shall take effect upon the date of hearing, provided the USEPA has no objections.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order No. 98-233 is rescinded, and the Shasta County Service Area No. 17 (Cottonwood Wastewater Treatment Plant), their agents, successors, and assigns, in order to meet the provisions contained in Division 7 of the California Water Code and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, shall comply with the following:

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. The discharge of effluent at a location or in a manner different from that described in the Findings, is prohibited.
2. The by-pass or overflow of wastes, except as allowed by Standard Provisions and Reporting Requirements for Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES) A.13, is prohibited.
3. Discharge of materials, other than storm water, that are not otherwise permitted by this Order to surface waters or surface water drainage courses, is prohibited.
4. Discharge of wastewater from sewage holding tanks into the treatment plant or collection system, without prior approval from the Executive Officer of the Regional Board, or his designee, is prohibited.

B. Effluent Limitations

1. The effluent discharge to Cottonwood Creek shall not exceed the following limitations:

<u>Constituent</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Monthly Average</u>	<u>Weekly Average</u>	<u>Monthly Maximum⁵</u>	<u>Daily Maximum</u>	<u>Hourly Average</u>	<u>4-day Average</u>
BOD ¹	mg/L	10	15	--	30	--	--
	lbs/day ²	36	54	--	108	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	--	30	--	--
	lbs/day ²	36	54	--	108	--	--
Settleable Solids	mL/L	0.1	--	--	0.2	--	--
Chlorine Residual ³	mg/L	--	--	--	--	0.02	0.01
Total Coliform Organisms ^{3,4}	MPN/100 mL	--	23 ⁶	240 ⁵	500	--	--

<u>Constituent</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Monthly Average</u>	<u>Weekly Average</u>	<u>Monthly Maximum</u> ⁵	<u>Daily Maximum</u>	<u>Hourly Average</u>	<u>4-day Average</u>
Copper (Total Recoverable)	ug/L	Must Calculate. See Attachment C.	--	--	Must Calculate. See Attachment C.	--	--
	lbs/day ²	Must Calculate. See footnote 2.	--	--	Must Calculate. See footnote 2.	--	--
Zinc (Total Recoverable)	ug/L	Must Calculate. See Attachment D.	--	--	Must Calculate. See Attachment D.	--	--
	lbs/day ²	Must Calculate. See footnote 2.	--	--	Must Calculate. See footnote 2.	--	--
¹ 5-day, 20°C biochemical oxygen demand ² Based upon a design flow of 0.43 mgd. Calculate lbs/day by multiplying concentration (mg/L) by 0.43 mgd flow and by 8.34 conversion factor. ³ Chlorine residual and total coliform shall be measured at the chlorine contact chamber discharge or other location approved by the Executive Officer. Effluent chlorine residual shall be measured continuously. ⁴ The effluent coliform sample shall be taken during the period when the highest daily effluent flow occurs. ⁵ Shall not exceed more than once in any 30 day period. ⁶ As a 7-day median average.							

2. The arithmetic mean BOD in effluent samples collected over a monthly period shall not exceed 15 percent of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples (85 percent removal).
3. The discharge shall not have a pH less than 6.0 nor greater than 9.0 units.
4. The 30-day average daily dry weather (May through October) discharge flow to Cottonwood Creek shall not exceed 0.43 million gallons.
5. Survival of test fishes in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted effluent shall be no less than:

Minimum for any one bioassay - - - - - 70%

Median for any three or more bioassays - - - - - 90%.
6. The Discharger shall use the best practicable cost-effective control technique currently available to limit mineralization of Cottonwood Creek to no more than a reasonable increment.

C. Discharge Specifications

1. Objectionable odors originating at the treatment plant shall not be perceivable beyond the property.
2. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded to the best practicable extent possible through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives
3. Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code.

D. Sludge Disposal

1. Collected screenings, sludge, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner approved by the Executive Officer and consistent with *Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing, or Disposal of Solid Waste*, as set forth in Title 27, CCR, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Section 20005, et seq.
2. Any proposed change in sludge use or disposal practice from a previously approved practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and USEPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.
3. Use and disposal of sewage sludge shall comply with existing federal and state laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 CFR Part 503.
4. If the SWRCB and the Regional Boards are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 CFR Part 503, this Order may be reopened to incorporate appropriate time schedules and technical standards. The Discharger must comply with the standards and time schedules contained in 40 CFR Part 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.
5. By **30 January of each year**, the Discharger shall submit a revised sludge management and disposal plan describing the annual volume of sludge generated by the treatment plant and specifying the sludge disposal practices. Refer to the Monitoring and Reporting Program for additional information on the required monitoring and reporting for sludge.

E. Receiving Water Limitations

Receiving water limitations are based upon water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan. As such, they are a required part of this permit.

The discharge shall not cause the following in Cottonwood Creek:

1. Concentration of dissolved oxygen to fall below 7.0 mg/L. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration shall not fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass, and the 95th percentile concentration shall not fall below 75 percent of saturation.
2. Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to form a visible film or coating on the water surface or on the stream bottom.
3. Oils, greases, waxes, floating material (liquids, solids, foams, and scums), or suspended material to create a nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
4. Aesthetically undesirable discoloration.
5. Fungi, slimes, or other objectionable growths.
6. Turbidity to increase as follows:
 - a. More than 1 Nephelometric Turbidity Units (NTUs) where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTUs.
 - b. More than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs.
 - c. More than 10 NTUs where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs.
 - d. More than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs.

In determining compliance with the above limitations, appropriate averaging periods may be applied upon approval by the Executive Officer.

7. The normal ambient pH to fall below 6.5, exceed 8.5, or change by more than 0.5 units. In determining compliance with the above limitations, appropriate averaging periods may be applied upon approval by the Executive Officer.
8. Deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
9. The normal ambient temperature to be altered by more than 5°F.
10. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that exceed maximum contaminant levels specified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 22; that harm human, plant, animal or aquatic life; or that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
11. Aquatic communities and populations, including vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant species, to be degraded.

12. Taste or odor-producing substances to impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
13. The fecal coliform concentration in any 30-day period to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL or cause more than 10 percent of the samples taken in any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.
14. Toxic pollutants to be present in the water column, sediments, or biota in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses; that produce detrimental response in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life; or that bioaccumulate in aquatic resources at levels which are harmful to human health.
15. Violations of any applicable water quality standard for receiving waters adopted by the Regional Board or the SWRCB pursuant to the CWA and regulations adopted thereunder.

F. Groundwater Limitations

Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the treatment plant, in combination with other sources of waste constituents, shall not cause the following in groundwater:

1. Beneficial uses to be unreasonably affected, water quality objectives to be exceeded, or cause a condition of pollution or nuisance.
2. Any increase in total coliform organisms to exceed 2.2 MPN/100 mL over any seven-day period.

G. Pretreatment Program Provisions

1. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the necessary legal authorities, programs, and controls to ensure that the following incompatible wastes are not introduced to the treatment system where incompatible wastes are:
 - a. Wastes which create a fire or explosion hazard in the treatment works;
 - b. Wastes which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case wastes with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is specially designed to accommodate such wastes;
 - c. Solid or viscous waste in amounts which cause obstruction to flow in sewers, or which cause other interference with proper operation or treatment works;

- d. Any waste, including oxygen demanding pollutants (BOD, etc.), released in such volume or strength as to cause inhibition or disruption in the treatment works, and subsequent treatment process upset and loss of treatment efficiency;
 - e. Heat in amounts that inhibit or disrupt biological activity in the treatment works, or that raise influent temperatures above 40°C (104°F), unless the treatment works is designed to accommodate such heat;
 - f. Petroleum oil, non-biodegradable cutting oil, or products of mineral oil origin in amounts that will cause interference or pass through;
 - g. Pollutants which result in the presence of toxic gases, vapors, or fumes within the treatment works in a quantity that may cause acute worker health and safety problems; and
 - h. Any trucked or hauled pollutants, except at points predesignated by the Discharger, and approved by the Executive Officer of the Regional Board, or his designee.
2. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the legal authorities, programs, and controls necessary to ensure that indirect discharges do not introduce pollutants into the sewage system that either alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources:
- a. Flow through the system to the receiving water in quantities or concentrations that cause a violation of this Order, or
 - b. Inhibit or disrupt treatment processes, treatment system operations, or sludge processes, use, or disposal and either cause a violation of this Order or prevent sludge use or disposal in accordance with this Order.

H. Provisions

1. The existing treatment facilities shall be operated and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency. New facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
2. The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the collection, treatment, and disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.
3. The Discharger shall conduct the acute toxicity testing specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. _____. If the testing indicates that the discharge causes unacceptable exceedances of the acute toxicity effluent limitation or water quality objective, the Discharger shall submit a workplan to conduct a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)

within 90 days of that determination and upon Executive Officer review conduct the TRE **within 180 days**. After completion of the TRE this Order may be reopened and a toxicity limitation included and/or a limitation for the specific toxicant(s) identified in the TRE included.

4. The Discharger shall conduct the chronic toxicity testing specified in Monitoring and Reporting Program No. _____. If the testing indicates that the discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above the water quality objective for toxicity, the Discharger shall submit a workplan to conduct a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) **within 90 days of that determination** and upon Executive Officer review conduct the TRE **within 180 days**, and this Order may be reopened and a toxicity limitation included and/or a limitation for the specific toxicant(s) identified in the TRE included. Additionally, if a chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the SWRCB, this Order may be reopened and a limitation based on that objective included.
5. The Discharger shall comply with the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program No. _____, which is a part of this Order, and any revisions thereto as ordered by the Executive Officer. When requested by USEPA, the Discharger shall complete and submit Discharge Monitoring Reports. The submittal date shall be no later than the submittal date specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program for Discharger Self-Monitoring Reports.
6. The Discharger shall provide certified wastewater treatment plant operators in accordance with regulations adopted by the SWRCB.
7. The Discharger shall maintain all portions of the wastewater collection system to assure compliance with this Order. Collection system overflows and/or discharges are prohibited by this Order. All violations of this Order must be reported as specified in the Standard Provisions and the public shall be notified, in coordination with the Health Department, in areas that have been contaminated with sewage. All parties with a reasonable potential for exposure to a sewage overflow event shall be notified.
8. **Within 12 months of the adoption of this Order**, the Discharger shall submit a report to the Executive Officer of the Regional Board that either establishes a management strategy for the acceptable operation of the treatment plant with only the new north sludge storage basin in operation, or that outlines a workplan and time schedule no longer than 36 months from the date this Order is adopted for repair/replacement of the south sludge storage basin. If improvements in addition to the north sludge storage basin are required, such improvements shall be completed and functioning **within 36 months of adoption of this Order**. The report shall be prepared and submitted by a California registered civil engineer, unless otherwise approved.
9. **Within 12 months of the adoption of this Order**, the Discharger shall submit a workplan and time schedule no longer than 36 months from the date this Order is adopted for the repair/replacement of the damaged effluent diffuser in Cottonwood Creek. The diffuser shall be repaired/replaced according to the original design specifications or an improved

design approved by the Executive Officer of the Regional Board, or his designee. The repaired/replaced diffuser shall be installed and functioning **within 36 months of the adoption of this Order**. The workplan and diffuser design shall be prepared and submitted by a California registered civil engineer, unless otherwise approved.

10. This Order requires the Discharger to report accurate receiving water stream flow measurements. If the Discharger is not able to utilize existing gage facilities, or is unable to provide accurate and timely data, then **within 18 months of the adoption of this Order**, the Discharger shall submit a workplan and time schedule no longer than 36 months from the date this Order is adopted for the installation of a stream flow gage in Cottonwood Creek. The gage shall be located in the vicinity and preferably upstream of the discharge location and shall accurately and reliably provide stream flow measurements throughout the low and very low flow seasons. The Discharger may be able to cooperatively install or upgrade an existing gage with another government entity, but shall remain responsible for ensuring the proper operation of the gage. The new or upgraded gage shall be installed and functioning **within 36 months of the adoption of this Order**. The workplan and gage design shall be prepared and submitted by a California registered civil engineer, unless otherwise approved.
11. **Within 24 months of the adoption of this Order**, the Discharger shall repair or replace the dosing controls for the chlorination/dechlorination processes at the treatment plant. The controls shall be automatically operated based on flow or concentration. Documentation of such repair/replacement shall be submitted to the Regional Board following completion of this task.
12. **Within 24 months of the adoption of this Order**, the Discharger shall install an electronic, real-time residual chlorine analyzer on the treatment plant effluent following the dechlorination process. The device shall continuously measure and record the chlorine residual and automatically notify the treatment plant operator of errors and effluent violations. The device shall have the sensitivity and accuracy to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limits for chlorine residual contained in this Order. Documentation of such installation shall be submitted to the Regional Board following completion of this task.
13. **Bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate Verification**
In order to verify if bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate is truly present in the receiving water or effluent discharge, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant. If changes in sampling and/or analytical procedures and equipment indicate that bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate is not present in the effluent or receiving water samples at concentrations that cause reasonable potential as defined by the SIP, then effluent limits are not necessary. If bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate continues to be detected in the effluent and/or receiving water, then this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation for bis-2-ethylhexylphthalate.

14. The Discharger shall conduct the monitoring and reporting specified in the attached Monitoring and Reporting Program. If sufficient information is collected and indicates that the discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an in-stream excursion above a narrative or numerical water quality standard, then this Order may be reopened to include effluent limit(s) to achieve water quality standards. Additionally, if pollutants are detected in discharges from the Discharger's facility, but insufficient information exists to establish an effluent limit or determine if an effluent limit is necessary, the Discharger may be required to conduct additional monitoring to provide sufficient information.
15. If applicable, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements of Division 20, Chapter 6.67 of the Health and Safety Code, known as the Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act. These requirements include preparation of a Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan in accordance with 40 CFR Part 112.
16. The Discharger shall report to the Regional Board **within 15 days** any toxic chemical release data it reports to the State Emergency Response Commission pursuant to Section 313 of the "Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986."
17. The Discharger shall comply with all the items of the "Standard Provisions and Reporting Requirements for Waste Discharge Requirements (NPDES)," dated 1 March 1991, which are a part of this Order. This attachment and its individual paragraphs are referred to as "Standard Provision(s)."
18. The Discharger may be required to submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer.
19. This Order expires on _____, and the Discharger must file a ROWD in accordance with Title 23, CCR, not later than **180 days** in advance of such date as application for issuance of new waste discharge requirements.
20. Prior to making any change in the discharge point, place of use, or purpose of use of the effluent the Discharger shall obtain approval of, or clearance from, the SWRCB, Division of Water Rights.
21. In the event of any change in control or ownership of land or waste discharge facilities presently owned or controlled by the Discharger, the Discharger shall notify the succeeding owner or operator of the existence of this Order by letter, a copy of which shall be immediately forwarded to this office.
22. To assume operation under this Order, the succeeding owner or operator must apply in writing to the Executive Officer requesting transfer of the Order. The request must contain the requesting entity's full legal name; the state of incorporation, if a corporation; the address and telephone number of the persons responsible for contact with the Regional Board; and a statement. The statement shall comply with the signatory paragraph of

Standard Provision D.6 and state that the new owner or operator assumes full responsibility for compliance with this Order. Failure to submit the request shall be considered a discharge without requirements, a violation of the California Water Code. Transfer shall be approved or disapproved in writing by the Executive Officer.

I, THOMAS R. PINKOS, Executive Officer, do hereby certify the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of an Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on _____ 2005.

THOMAS R. PINKOS
Executive Officer

BJS
01/19/2005